



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,585	02/06/2002	Toshihisa Nakamura	121.1021	5802

21171 7590 05/11/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/066,585

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.
2. The IDS submitted on 2/6/2002 have been considered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- NE
4. <sup>ove</sup>Claims 3, 5-9 and 13-18 <sup>N</sup>rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tan et al (Tan), US 6,760,745.

5. As per claim 3, Tan taught the invention as claimed including a processing apparatus, comprising

- a. A signal receiving unit receiving a request from a first control unit (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5);
- b. An execution unit executing processing in response to the request and generating processing results (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 54-59, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5, 9-12); and

- c. A remote operation control unit simultaneously transmitting the processing results to the first control unit and to the second control unit different from the first control unit (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 17-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

6. As per claim 7, Tan taught the invention as claimed including a management apparatus, comprising:

- a. A signal receiving unit receiving a request from a first apparatus (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5);
- b. An execution unit executing processing in response to the request and generating processing results (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 54-59, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5, 9-12); and
- c. A remote operation control unit simultaneously transmitting the processing results to first apparatus and to a second apparatus different from the first apparatus (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 17-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

7. As per claims 13 and 17-18, Tan taught the invention as claimed including a remote operation method and process, comprising:

- a. Receiving a processing request from a first control unit (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5), executing processing in response to the request and generating processing results (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7,

Art Unit: 2154

lines 54-59, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5, 9-12), and simultaneously transmitting the processing results to the first control unit and to a second control unit that is different from the first control unit (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 17-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

8. As per claim 16, Tan taught the invention as claimed including a remote operation method comprising:

- a. Receiving a processing request from a first apparatus connected to a second apparatus by a network (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5);
- b. Executing processing in response to the processing request and generating processing results (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 54-59, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5, 9-12); and
- c. Simultaneously transmitting the processing results to the first apparatus and to the second apparatus (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 17-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

9. As per claims 5, 8 and 14, Tan taught the invention as claimed in claim 3, 7 and 13. Tan further taught that the second control unit comprises a plurality of control units (col.8, lines 31-34; at least one).

Art Unit: 2154

10. As per claims 6, 9 and 15, Tan taught the invention as claimed in claims 3, 7, 10 and 13. Tan further taught that the request is a request to obtain a web page (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 49-59, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5), the execution unit obtains the web page (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 54-59, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14, 49-59, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5, 9-12, 24-49), and the remote operation control unit simultaneously transmits the web page obtained by the execution unit to the first control unit and to the second control unit (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 17-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 4, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al (Tan), US 6,760,745, in view of Bala et al (Bala), US 6,650,747.

13. As per claim 4, Tan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3. Tan did not specifically teach that the request is to remotely operate the second control unit. Bala taught to have the first device to remotely operate a second device (col.8, lines 65-67, col.9, lines 1-67, col.10, lines 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tan and Bala because Bala's teaching of

Art Unit: 2154

remotely controlling enables Tan's method to view the desktop of a remote station and perform operation on the remote station (Bala, col.9, lines 4-11).

14. As per claim 10, Tan taught the invention substantially as claimed including a computer system, comprising:

- a. A first apparatus (col.6, lines 18-23, col.7, lines 15-20);
- b. A management apparatus receiving processing requests from the first apparatus, executing processing in response to the processing requests, and generating processing results (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5); and
- c. A second apparatus (col.8, lines 31-37, col.10, lines 25-36; fig.4: 425), wherein the management apparatus simultaneously transmits the processing results to the first apparatus and to the second apparatus, and the second apparatus executing processing in response to the processing results (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 17-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

15. Tan did not specifically teach that the second apparatus is remotely operated by the first apparatus. Bala taught to have the first device to remotely operate a second device (col.8, lines 65-67, col.9, lines 1-67, col.10, lines 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tan and Bala because Bala's teaching of remotely controlling enables Tan's method to view the desktop of a remote station and perform operation on the remote station (Bala, col.9, lines 4-11).

16. As per claim 12, Tan and Bala taught the invention as claimed in claim 10. Tan further taught that the request is a request to obtain a web page (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 49-59, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5), the execution unit obtains the web page (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 54-59, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14, 49-59, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5, 9-12, 24-49), and the remote operation control unit simultaneously transmits the web page obtained by the execution unit to the first control unit and to the second control unit (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 17-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

17. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan and Bala as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Eikeland, US 5,768,508.

18. As per claim 11, Tan and Bala taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 10. Tan and Bala did not specifically teach that the user operation of the second apparatus is disabled when the second apparatus is being remotely operated. Eikeland taught to disable user operations of the second device (col.7, lines 2-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tan, Bala and Eikeland because Eikeland's teaching of disabling input operations ensures the users of Tan and Bala's method to view information displayed on the screen without interruption (Eikeland, col.7, lines 2-6).



Art Unit: 2154

19. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al (Tan), US 6,760,745, in view of Bala et al (Bala), US 6,650,747, and Eikeland, US 5,768,508.

20. As per claim 1, Tan taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method, comprising:

- a. Sending a request from a first device to a management device (col.4, lines 4-9);
- b. Sending another request from the first device to the management device to obtain a web page (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5);
- c. Obtaining the web page by the management device from a web server and sending the web page to the first device and to the second device (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 54-59, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5, 9-12, col.10, lines 17-60); and
- d. Displaying the web page on a display of the first device and the second device (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 54-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

21. Tan did not specifically teach to request to remotely operate the second device and disabling, by the management device, user operation of the second device and establishing a remote operation relationship between the first device as a master device and the second device as a slave device. Bala taught to remotely operate a second device and establishing a remote operation relationship between the first device as a master device and the second device as a

Art Unit: 2154

slave device (col.8, lines 65-67, col.9, lines 1-67, col.10, lines 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tan and Bala because Bala's teaching of remotely controlling enables Tan's method to view the desktop of a remote station and perform operation on the remote station (Bala, col.9, lines 4-11). Tan and Bala did not specifically teach to disable user operation of the second device. Eikeland taught to disable user operations of the second device (col.7, lines 2-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tan, Bala and Eikeland because Eikeland's teaching of disabling input operations ensures the users of Tan and Bala's method to view information displayed on the screen without interruption (Eikeland, col.7, lines 2-6).

22. As per claim 2, Tan taught the invention substantially as claimed including a remote operation system, comprising:

- a. A management device (col.7, lines 31-34; fig.4: 410, 420);
- b. A first device connected to the management device via a network (col.6, lines 20-23, col.7, lines 15-24, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14; fig.4: 405); and
- c. A second device connected to the management device via a network (col.8, lines 31-37, col.10, lines 25-36; fig.4: 425),

Wherein the first device sends a request to the management device (col.4, lines 4-9), the first device sends another request to the management device to obtain a web page (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 38-47, 52-59, col.8, lines 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5), the management device obtains the web page from a web server and sends the web page obtained to the first device and to the

Art Unit: 2154

second device (col.4, lines 4-9, col.7, lines 54-59, col.8, lines 1-5, 9-14, 66-67, col.9, lines 1-5, 9-12, col.10, lines 17-60), and the first device and the second device each display the web page on a display (col.4, lines 4-16, col.8, lines 31-39, col.10, lines 54-60, col.17, lines 15-23, 31-34).

23. Tan did not specifically teach to request to remotely operate the second device and disabling, by the management device, user operation of the second device and establishing a remote operation relationship between the first device as a master device and the second device as a slave device. Bala taught to remotely operate a second device and establishing a remote operation relationship between the first device as a master device and the second device as a slave device (col.8, lines 65-67, col.9, lines 1-67, col.10, lines 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tan and Bala because Bala's teaching of remotely controlling enables Tan's method to view the desktop of a remote station and perform operation on the remote station (Bala, col.9, lines 4-11). Tan and Bala because Bala's teaching of remotely controlling enables Tan's method to view the desktop of a remote station and perform operation on the remote station (Bala, col.9, lines 4-11). Tan and Bala did not specifically teach to disable user operation of the second device. Eikeland taught to disable user operations of the second device (col.7, lines 2-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tan, Bala and Eikeland because Eikeland's teaching of disabling input operations ensures the users of Tan and Bala's method to view information displayed on the screen without interruption (Eikeland, col.7, lines 2-6).

*Conclusion*

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dunlap et al, US 6,560,637.

Thompson, Jr., US 5,719,563.

Huang et al, US 6,571,245.

Richardson et al, "Virtual Network Computing", IEEE Internet Computing, January-February 1998, pp. 33-38.

25. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl

May 5, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. S. Hadji", with a long, sweeping diagonal line extending downwards and to the right from the end of the signature.